

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE **Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

LK		Wasini	igion, D.C. 20231	LK
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/110,615	07/06/98	EIBERGER	B	PHD97.095
Γ		LM02/0823 · ¬		EXAMINER
JACK E HAKE	hand I that day 2 had but day had	WONG,	А	
US PHILIPS		···	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
580 WHITE F	AL PROP DEP [.] PLAINS ROAD	I	2713	5
TARRYTOWN N	VY 10591		DATE MAILED:	08/23/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	09/110,615	EIBERGER, BERTHOLD				
Cincerionen Cummary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Allen Wong	2713				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appearage Period for Reply	ars on the cover sheet with the co	prrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.						
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Status 	cation. s, a reply within the statutory minimum o period will apply and will expire SIX (6)	f thirty (30) days will MONTHS from the mailing date of this				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	— · s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:						
1. received.	ED copies of the phoney docume	into have been.				
2. received in Application No. (Series Code	/ Serial Number)					
3. received in this National Stage application	n from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).						
Attachment(s)						
 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 	19) 🔲 Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				



Art Unit: 2713

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poetsch (4,875,102).

Regarding claim 1, Poetsch discloses a film scanner comprising:

a first scanning device (see fig.5 and col.5, lines 50-68; note scanning device 14 scans cinematographic film frames) for scanning frames of a cinematographic film by means of photoelectric transducers, and

a second scanning device (see fig.5 and col.6, lines 1-3; note scanning device 8 scans sprocket holes) for scanning the sprocket holes.

Poetsch does not appear to mention the limitation of wherein the spectral sensitivities of the first and second scanning devices lie in maximally different spectral ranges.

However, Poetsch teaches the scanning of sprocket holes by using a laser (see fig.11) which is known for having variable high frequencies such as infrared light, etc.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would obviously recognize and acknowledge that the first light source, used for scanning frames, is maximally, spectrally different from the second light source, used for scanning sprocket holes, because the spectral



Art Unit: 2713

range for a laser is much different from the light source (ie. white light) used for scanning frames.

Regarding claim 6, Poetsch discloses a scanning device for scanning sprocket holes comprising a light source (fig.11, element 90) to generate light and at least one scanning sensor (fig.11, element 81). Although Poetsch does not appear to mention the use of an infrared light source and an infrared light sensor, it is clearly obvious to one of ordinary skilled to use an infrared laser light source and an infrared light sensor for scanning sprocket holes so as to ensure the picture's steadiness and maintain high picture quality.

As for claims 2-5 and 7-9, Poetsch further discloses an optical filter (see figs.6-16; note the optical setup) and a laser light source (fig.11, element 90) and a scanning sensor (fig.11, element 81). Although Poetsch does not appear to mention a common light source, it is obvious to have a common light source for illuminating the film. Also, Poetsch does not appear to disclose the use of separate light sources. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled to use separate light sources for preventing the overlapping of light sources for preserving picture quality and prevent the film from being ruined. And to one of ordinary skill in the art, it is well known for cameras to have telecentric imaging optics since optical elements are effective depending on the position of the optical elements.



Art Unit: 2713

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (703) 306-5978. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 9-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

AW August 21, 2000 CHRIS S. KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700